DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 287 531 JC 870 464

TITLE AB 1725, IV: Part-Time Faculty.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Board of Governors.
PUB DATE Oct 87
NOTE 13p.; Discussed as Agenda Item Number 5 at a meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Santa Monica, CA, October 29-30, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Community Colleges; Educational Legislation; *Part Time Faculty; *Policy Formation; State Legislation; Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

An overview is provided of issues related to the use of part-time faculty in community colleges in California and elsewhere in the nation. First, background information is provided on the major relevant issues. This section: (1) lists the teaching functions which are best carried out by full-time instructors as argued by those who favor employing more full-time faculty; (2) reviews current California policy, which leaves almost all decisions on the use and support of part-time faculty to the local community colleges within a statutory limit restricting districts to using part-time faculty to teach no more than 30% of a district's workload; (3) provides an overview of the characteristics of part-time faculty as a group; and (4) offers a summary of existing statewide policies on the use and support of part-time faculty. The next section contrasts the policy proposals put forth in recent years by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Master Plan Review Commission, the Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan, and the Assembly Bill 3409 Task Force on Community College Faculty and Administrator Qualifications, Hiring, Evaluation and Retention. After presenting the major provisions of Assembly Bill 1725 on part-time faculty and explaining their intent, the paper discusses the various policy options in terms of status distinctions, use, workload, support, evaluation, compensation, and governance issues. (UCM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED287531

Agenda Item 5 Part IV
"Part-Time Faculty"

Meeting of the
Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges

October 29-30, 1987
Santa Monica City College
Santa Monica, California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 870 464

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Background

The use of part-time faculty in community colleges has been a major concern for more than a decade in California and elsewhere in the nation. Part-time faculty provide community colleges hiring flexibility and, in some cases, needed subject expertise -- at less cost than full-time faculty. However, part-time faculty seldom advise students, develop curricula, or participate in college governance. Some part-time faculty who are seeking full-time employment argue that they are being exploited.

Those who favor employing more full-time faculty argue that the majority of the teaching functions listed below are best carried out by full-time instructors.

- Regarding teaching in the classroom, a faculty member must have expertise in the subject field and must keep current with changes occurring in his or her discipline. This is often accomplished by outside reading, attending in professional conferences, presenting papers and talks, writing articles or textbooks in the field, conducting research in the field, and, in the case of vocational education, maintaining contact with industry. Crucial to the teaching itself and its affect upon students is the level of enthusiasm and energy of the faculty member. This is often a function of the amount of time there has been for preparation and review. Also crucial to this is the time to prepare and grade homework assignments, since, unlike other segments of higher education, community college faculty do not have teaching assistants or graders to help them. Faculty must also prepare and grade test instruments, most often creating their own, instead of just using publisher tests.

- Direct contact with students outside of class is also a major role of faculty. The most familiar of these are office hours. Typically a faculty member has one office hour for each three hours in class or five office hours per week in addition to a 15-hour per week teaching schedule. But besides office hours, most faculty spend additional unscheduled hours, typically before and after class and by special appointment working with students. The combined activities include: direct help in class work; special tutoring for basic skills, study habits, and preparation for courses for weaker students; extra work and discussion for more advanced students; independent study and reading for particularly interested or advanced students; academic advising -- including course selection for majors, advising on the proper course sequences both in the field and related subjects; career counseling -- particularly in vocational education; preparing and administering make-up tests; working with students who may want to drop a course; talking with students about personal problems; and advising students who are interested, but undecided about, a specific major.

- The teaching itself must also be viewed in the context of the instructional program of the college itself. Faculty are in charge of preparing the actual degree, certificate and major programs, including courses in the field and related courses. They prepare course outlines, review and select textbooks, workbooks, and other class materials, determine course prerequisites, write course descriptions for catalogues, determine basic skill prerequisites for each course, select and order audio-visual materials, and select outside reading or other audio-visual materials material for the library or media center use of the student. Even the equipment and supplies used in classes are determined and selected by the faculty member. Most faculty are responsible for the choice of brands and vendors, investigating prices and quality and proposing budgets and writing requisitions for the materials.

- Faculty make up the largest, most stable, longest term employees of the college, most dedicated to the long-term success of the institution. They comprise all or the majority of the academic senate of the college and district. They serve on the many committees of the college, including the curriculum committee, where they usually have the central, controlling role. They also serve on student personnel, student grievance, faculty grievance, library, bookstore, and vocational advisory committees, in addition to community service and union-management negotiation. They are the major participants in the recurring accreditation process and are usually responsible for writing most of the report. They also are centrally involved in extracurricular activities of students, including serving as club sponsors, advising student government, coaching intercollegiate and intramural sports, and participating in plays, social activities, and a myriad of out-of-classroom functions that give depth and breadth to the college experience. They are often a major link of the college to the community, participating in speakers bureau and other community-based activities. With the proposed state reforms, faculty, who in some cases are already involved, will be more involved in hiring of colleagues, hiring of administrators, peer evaluation of colleagues, and recommendations for tenure or dismissal.

Issues regarding part-time faculty involve their status, use, workload, support, evaluation and compensation. Resolution of these issues can be aided by examining current policy and practice.

Current California Policy

In California's community colleges, part-time faculty are defined as those who teach not more than 60% of a full-time load (typically a full-time load is four or more classes). Part-time faculty are temporary, do not gain tenure rights, and have no right to notice or hearing if they are not to be rehired.

Like most other states, California has few uniform statewide policies on the use and support of part-time faculty, leaving virtually all such decisions up to the local community colleges. Statutes defining the status of part-time faculty exist, but have been the subject of considerable litigation. Moreover, although there is a statutory limit to discourage the use of part-time faculty (Education Code Section 87613), there are no specific sanctions if colleges do not comply. In fact, funding policies encourage greater use of part-time faculty -- especially in times of inadequate funding (part-time faculty normally incur 25% fewer costs than full-time faculty).

Statutory limits on the use of part-time faculty were first enacted in 1981 and were recently extended to 1989 by SB 630 (1987). Under this statute, districts are restricted from using part-time faculty to teach more than 30% of a district's workload or the average workload employed between 1980 and 1983. Districts determine if they are out of compliance and, if so, submit corrective plans to the Board of Governors for approval. There are no statewide limits on the amount of part-time overload teaching that may be assigned to full-time faculty, although some local collective bargaining contracts and district policies address this issue.

During the 1980s, there have been few changes in the way California community college districts deal with part-time faculty. One exception is that districts evaluate their part-time faculty more frequently now than was the case five years ago. And, while not legally required, 39 districts provide part-time faculty with limited rights. However, only a fraction of the districts provide part-time faculty with reemployment rights (14 of 70), include them in staff development programs (23), or offer then fringe benefits (16). The pay differential (three-fifths the rate paid to full-time faculty) has been stable for at least ten years.

California's use of part-time faculty has fluctuated in the last ten years because of changes to budgets and enrollment. Currently, six of every ten community college faculty are employed part-time and teach one-third of all class hours. The average part-time faculty member teaches just over five hours per week. The average full-time assignment, by contrast, is 16 hours per week and one-third of the full-time faculty also teach overload assignments on a part-time basis.

While many part-time faculty teach in the evening and in noncredit instruction, one-fifth of them teach only during the day, and nearly one-third of the class hours of credit instruction is taught by part-time faculty.

Group Characteristics

In general, part-time faculty are younger and more often female than are full-time faculty, but their racial and ethnic backgrounds are similar. Their work patterns are very heterogeneous: some teach part-time at several institutions, others teach full-time at another institution, others work full-time in business, and still others are self-employed. While there are no precise estimates, it's possible that as many as

one in every five part-time faculty are teaching part-time in more than one institution, are committed teachers, and would prefer full-time employment.

Part-time faculty have less prior education and have less teaching experience than do full-time faculty. Despite this, there is no definitive research that shows a significant difference in the quality of instruction in classes taught by part-time as contrasted to full-time faculty. However, since few community colleges provide part-time faculty with adequate support or require them to advise students, develop curriculum, or participate in governance, there may be a difference in overall instructional quality when too many part-time faculty are employed.

Other States

There are few uniform statewide policies elsewhere in the country on the use and support of part-time faculty; most decisions about them are left to the determination of local colleges. Only one-fifth of the other states report having a statewide statute or regulation that limits the use of part-time faculty. And only one state reports having a statewide statute that requires part-time faculty to participate in out-of-class activities, though all states report that their local colleges require some out-of-class activity -- most often program and course development, assisting students in registration, serving on instructional committees, and holding office hours.

Policy Proposals

A variety of major policy changes for part-time faculty have been proposed in recent years.

Board of Governors

The last general Board of Governors policy position on the subject of part-time faculty was adopted in January 1978. The Board proposed that:

- regular status be extended to part-timers who have taught at least 41% of a full-time load for an equivalent of three full-time years;
- not more than 25% of a district's course hours be taught by those hired for less than 41% of a full-time load (excluding noncredit hours and nontraditional colleges);
- pro-rata pay not be used where in-class and out-of-class responsibilities for full-time faculty and part-time faculty were the same; and

- policy on overload teaching by full-time faculty should be determined locally until another approach was warranted.

The Board also has adopted a number of more recent positions on specific bills that deal with part-time faculty: taking a neutral position on a 1985 bill that would have allocated less funds for faculty development to those districts with more part-time faculty and opposing legislation to reduce the use of part-time faculty without the necessary funding to do so.

Master Plan Review Commission

The Master Plan Review Commission has recommended that the Legislature:

- eliminate credential requirements;
- repeal the statutory restriction on use of part-time faculty;
- authorize districts to employ faculty who teach six or more units on a contract basis; and
- authorize the Board of Governors to:
  - (1) establish a statewide policy for community colleges to maintain a core of experienced full-time faculty in each department;
  - (2) establish qualifications for faculty employment with all new appointments (full-time and part-time alike) subject to peer review;
  - (3) extend the probation period for full-time faculty to gain tenure (to at least four years);
  - (4) establish a system of peer review for tenure and periodic evaluations of part-time, probation, and tenured faculty by peers, students, and administrators to be used for decisions on advancement;
  - (5) develop and pilot test a program of two- to five-year rolling contracts as an alternative to tenure; and
  - (6) develop and implement a plan for professional development programs for faculty and administrators (linked to regular evaluation and supported by funding to be allocated by the Board).

Joint Legislative Committee

The Joint Legislative Committee on the Master Plan has proposed:

- a new Board of Governors policy to strengthen "the core of experienced full-time faculty in each department" through faculty and administrative consultation;
- a pilot test of two-year "rolling contracts" for part-time faculty who would advise students and develop curricula for pay; and
- a special instructional fund (SIF) to pay districts hiring full-time probationary faculty to replace part-time faculty and to meet affirmative action goals, using SIF dollars for new programs.

Work by the Joint Committee led to the creation, through AB 3409 (1986), of a task force to study faculty and administrator qualifications, peer review, hiring, and retention.

AB 3409 Task Force

The AB 3409 Task Force on Community College Faculty and Administrator Qualifications, Hiring, Evaluation and Retention has recommended that use of part-time faculty be reduced by an unspecified amount. The Task Force argues that the recommended longer probationary period will provide additional administrative flexibility that should reduce the need to use part-time instructors.

AB 1725 (1987)

While the Joint Committee continues its work, many of the above recommendations have already been incorporated in AB 1725. This bill sets forth many changes in community college staff qualifications, professional development, tenure, evaluation, and affirmative action.

Language

The bill's major provision on part-time faculty would add Section 87482.6 to the Education Code:

> 87482.6. (a) The Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges shall develop standards by regulation, on or before July 1, 1990, after consultation with certificated and administrative community college personnel, regarding full-time to part-time employee staffing

ratios in each area of specialization, designed to maximize the practice of hiring employees as full-time employees and to limit the practice of hiring employees as part-time employees to meet the staffing requirements of the community colleges. On or before January 1, 1990, each community college district shall reduce the share of the overall workload borne by part-time certificated personnel, in accordance with the standard pursuant to this section.

(b) A board of governors Instructional Staffing Fund is hereby established for purposes of this section.

The September 1, 1987 version of AB 1725 appropriates $52.8 million for the three years 1987 to 1990 for the purposes of the above section. *Note:* The AB 3409 Task Force on Finance has proposed an implementation strategy for this section.

In addition, the bill would require that part-time faculty be evaluated once every six semesters or nine quarters (Section 87663(a)). Beyond these provisions, the bill makes no other changes to the status of part-timers.

Intent

AB 1725 speaks to the use and evaluation of part-timers, but ignores their status, workload, support, and compensation. The intent is to induce districts to reduce their reliance on part-time faculty over a three year period. The appropriation for this, $52.8 million, is designed to raise the percentage of credit-class hours taught by full-time instructors from 68% to 75% over a three year period. The bill is silent on *how* these funds would be allocated (formula or other means) and *by whom* (Legislature, Board, or Chancellor's Office).

The Board would set full-time to part-time staffing ratios for each "area of specialization," though the bill is not clear on how the latter is to be defined. Nor is the bill clear on how and by whom these ratios are to be monitored.

Presumably, the newly mandated evaluation of part-timers in AB 1725 is designed to bring them under greater scrutiny. Each part-timer would be evaluated at the end of three years of service. Currently, one-fourth of the part-time faculty are new each year. Surveys suggest that less than one-half of the part-time faculty would ever be evaluated under the AB 1725 proposal. Moreover, the proposed policy requires a less frequent evaluation than do local policies currently used by 54 of 70 districts.

Policy Options

While changes in policy and practice appear warranted, most will involve some cost. The policies discussed below must be consistent and should not work counter to one

another. They should also address governance issues: How and by whom are the new policies to be managed?

Status

Current policies treat all part-time faculty the same even though they are a very heterogeneous group. Useful status distinctions could be adopted based on teaching load, length of service, work at more than one institution, and interest in teaching.

Policies could be proposed to:

- Shift the full-time threshold from 60% to 40%.

- Create a new category of faculty with rights and benefits that fall between those of full-time and part-time faculty. This group could be made eligible for rolling contracts (the Master Plan Review Commission and Joint Committee recommendations).

Use

There is general agreement that academic departments need a core of full-time faculty to review and develop curriculum, to explore new instructional methods, and to carry on the professional activities necessary for a viable academic enterprise and to maintain the department's program. The size of that core and how to assure its existence are at issue.

It appears that this core may vary appropriately by discipline, clientele, and size of college. Departments in which predominantly noncredit courses are taught to part-time students, perhaps off-campus in a "nontraditional" college, would require a smaller core than the traditional academic department.

The current statutory limit ignores these variations, lacks any sanctions and is counteracted by budget incentives. Possible policy changes need to be flexible, enforceable, and consistent with budget incentives. Moreover policy changes should not penalize those districts which have used few part-time faculty in the past.

Possible changes include:

- Incentive funding to replace part-time with full-time faculty. This could be implemented by formula, plan review (submitted by districts, reviewed by the Chancellor's Office), or a combination of the two methods.

- Revised restrictions on the use of part-time faculty -- with sanctions.

- Program-based funding which reflects enrollment changes resulting from the use of full-time versus part-time faculty.

- Require that vacant and new positions be filled only by full-time faculty.

It must be noted that an increase in the use of full-time staff would also significantly increase operational costs. In general, one full-time instructor performs the class work of three part-timers -- but at an added cost of $29,000 per year. This change also produces a one-third increase in work on student advising, curriculum development, academic governance and other nonclassroom duties required of full-time teachers, but not of part-time. Each percentage-point increase in the class hours taught by full-time faculty costs an additional $7 million statewide.

Workload

Full-time faculty spend an average of 16 hours per week in class, probably a similar amount of time outside of class on class work (preparing lectures and lab demonstrations, grading papers, etc.), and up to ten hours per week advising students, developing curriculum, and participating in academic governance. Possibly over half of these full-time faculty work at a second job part time -- either teaching overload (one-third do so) or in an off-campus job.

By contrast, few part-time faculty are required to engage in any activities outside class aside from work that is strictly class-related. Specific practices vary widely among those few districts that do require additional duties.

The following possible changes would require additional funding:

- Requiring some or all part-time faculty to advise students, develop curriculum, participate in college governance, assist in evaluating and selecting other faculty, and/or other out-of-class activities.

- Incentive funding for districts electing to require some or all part-timers to engage in duties other than classroom teaching.

Support

In general, part-time faculty are afforded less support than are full-time faculty. The degree to which this affects the quality of instruction has not been established. Studies demonstrate that part-time faculty lack information on institutional practices such as grading, on instructional methods, and, sometimes, on the latest changes to the subject matter they are teaching. Moreover, part-time faculty often are hired with little time to prepare for their first class. Staff orientation, development and support for part-timers is inconsistent among the colleges.

Some of the policy options listed below have been implemented in certain districts; yet, no statewide policy exists. Policy could be proposed to:

- Require programs of institutional orientation for part-time faculty.
- Include part-time faculty in professional development activities.
- Require part-time faculty to be hired at least one month prior to the opening session of the class they are to teach.
- Provide mentors for the part-time faculty from among the full-time faculty.
- Make available similar library, media, and departmental clerical support for part-time faculty as is available for full-time faculty.

While districts may employ some or all of these policies now, more would likely adopt them if incentive funding were provided to districts that improve their support of part-time faculty.

Evaluation

While there is no statutory requirement, all but eleven California community college districts have formal policies for the evaluation of part-time faculty. As noted, evaluations are more frequent today and often involve teams of other faculty.

Among possible changes that may be considered are to:

- Evaluate part-time faculty in the same way as full-time faculty.
- Evaluate part-time faculty on a different timetable (say, each term for one or two years) than full-time faculty.
- Mandate the use of peers, students and administrative teams to evaluate part-time faculty.

Compensation

The debate on compensation of part-time faculty centers around questions of equal pay for equal work, lack of fringe benefits (particularly for those teaching at more than one college) and pay for out-of-classroom assignments. Fiscal constraints have impeded efforts toward change.

Possible changes to current policy include requiring:

- Full pro-rata compensation for some or all part-time faculty.
- Partial pro-rata compensation for some or all part-time faculty.
- An increase in the number of fringe benefits for part-time faculty.

The cost of these options can be estimated by computing the hourly difference between full-time and part-time compensation, then applying the approximate number of hours taught by part-time faculty. Under this formula, the cost of full pro-rata pay for all part-time community college faculty would be $81 million, including $69 million for salaries and $12 million for mandatory benefits. Adding optional benefits to this would require another $17 million.

Governance Issues

A complete approach to solving part-time issues should also answer governance questions: Where are policies to be decided and how are they to be communicated and implemented? The obvious agents include:

(a) The Legislature (Education Code),

(b) Board of Governors (Title 5 of the Administrative Code),

(c) Community college districts and/or colleges (in trustee or administrative policies, collective bargaining contracts, and/or personnel manuals), and

(d) Individual college divisions and departments.

To what extent should the policy be prescriptive? Should the Legislature declare a broad statement of intent and objectives in the Education Code and leave implementation up to the Board of Governors and districts? Recent reform proposals have generally sought to shift authority and responsibility for academic and faculty matters from the Legislature to the Board of Governors. On the other hand, because collective bargaining exists for community colleges, and because another state agency (Public Employment Relations Board) oversees this process, these policies probably can't be delegated wholesale to the Board.

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges DEC 04 1987